

Community Social Assessment

SOCIAL CONDITIONS

The following discussion summarizes existing social and demographic conditions in Layton City and in the neighborhoods that surround the proposed roadway and highway interchange construction locations. A Community Social Assessment was completed for the Layton Interchange project by Dr. Richard Krannich of Rocky Mountain Social Science. Attention was focused in part on the extent to which the project might have disproportionate impacts on particularly vulnerable populations such as racial/ethnic minorities, the elderly, or persons in economically disadvantaged households. The assessment also addressed potential project effects on community social organization, including levels of localized social interaction and activity patterns, neighborhood social integration and community cohesion, and other key quality of life dimensions. Also considered were residents' perceptions of existing neighborhood and community traffic problems, and their views regarding possible effects of the proposed transportation system upgrades on their community and their neighborhood.

What data sources and methods were used to assess local social conditions?

The community social assessment effort was based on the acquisition and analysis of several types of data. First, data from the 2000 Census of Population for Layton City and more localized portions of the city within the project study area were acquired from the U.S. Census Bureau's web site (<http://factfinder.census.gov>). More current estimates of population size and composition were also accessed from Census Bureau data files as well as other on-line data sources. These data provide a general profile of social and demographic conditions and trends in the overall community and in more localized areas that surround the project area.

A second component of the data collection and analysis effort involved administration of self-completion survey questionnaires to representative samples of residential households in three spatially-distinct portions of the project area:

- **"Project adjacent" households.** This category includes residences located on parcels that are immediately adjacent to proposed project construction corridors and sites. A total of 101 non-vacant residences were identified within this "project adjacent" category, including 12 properties located along Larsen Lane, 15 properties located along or adjacent to 300 East, and 77 properties located within the mobile home park at 189 South Main Street. 75 households in this category were selected for participation in the survey.
- **"Nearby off-corridor" households.** This category includes residences that are not immediately adjacent to proposed project construction areas, but are in close proximity (within approximately a 2-3 block distance). A total of 304 property addresses were initially identified in this category, and a random sample of 100 cases was selected from that list. Of these 7 addresses were determined to be

either vacant or in non-residential use, resulting in an adjusted sample size of 93 households.

- “Distant off-corridor” households. This category includes residences located elsewhere within the study area, at greater distance from proposed construction locations. The data base used to identify residential properties produced a listing of 1,975 property addresses in this category, and a random sample of 100 cases was selected. Seven of these addresses were subsequently deleted because they were vacant or in non-residential use, reducing the effective sample size to 93 households.

Surveys were administered to households included in these three spatially-distinct portions of the study area during late September and early October, 2007 using a personalized drop-off/pick-up methodology. Completed questionnaires were retrieved from 204 of the 261 households included in the combined samples, representing an overall survey response rate of 78%. Response rates for the three sampling areas were 73% in the “project adjacent” category, 77% in the “nearby off-corridor” category, and 82% in the “distant off-corridor” category.

Overall, what social conditions and trends characterize the local community?

Layton City has experienced substantial and sustained population growth in recent years. Total population grew from 41,784 residents in 1990 to 58,474 in 2000, a 49% increase. Population estimates provided by the U.S. Census Bureau indicate that Layton’s population grew to an estimated 62,716 by 2006, an increase of 7.25% over the census total reported for 2000 (<http://factfinder.census.gov>). Unofficial population estimates indicate that by 2007 the citywide population had increased to 63,518, with about 61% of that total located in the western portions of the city delineated by the 84041 zip code area ([www.bestplaces.net/zip-code/Layton UT](http://www.bestplaces.net/zip-code/Layton_UT)).

At the time of the 2000 U.S. Census Layton exhibited limited racial or ethnic diversity, with 10.1% of the city’s population classified as non-white and 7% classified as Hispanic. There is some evidence that the concentration of racial and ethnic minority populations is slightly higher in west Layton (zip code 84041, where in 2007 an estimated 12.7% of residents were non-white and 8.7% were Hispanic) than in east Layton (zip code 84040, where an estimated 7.3% of residents were non-white and 5% were Hispanic) ([www.bestplaces.net/zip-code/Layton UT](http://www.bestplaces.net/zip-code/Layton_UT)). In 2000 5.7% of Layton residents were age 65 or older. At the time of the 2000 Census the median household income reported for Layton was \$52,128, well above the median of \$45,726 reported for the state as a whole. Approximately 16% of households had incomes under \$25,000, and 5.6% of residents lived in households in which income fell below the federally-designated poverty level.

An approximation of social and demographic characteristics for more localized portions of Layton that overlap with portions of the project study area can be derived from 2000 Census data reported for relatively small “block group” areas. Three of these census-defined block groups provide coverage that coincides roughly with major portions of west Layton that are included in the study area (see Figure 3-1):

- **Block Group 3 in Census Tract 1260**, which encompasses the eastern portions of the study area, is bounded on the north by 1000 North street, on the east by I-15, on the south by Phillips Street, on the southwest by Flint Street and Dawson Street, and on the northwest by a railroad line corridor that runs along 450 West and along McCormick Way. This area is characterized by a mixture of commercial and residential land use; most of the residential neighborhoods are long-established and contain primarily older homes.
- **Block Group 4 in Census Tract 1260**, located immediately west of Block Group 3, is bounded on the north by 1000 North, on the east by the rail line that parallels 450 West and McCormick Way, on the south by Dawson Street and Larson Lane, and on the west by a second rail line that runs from southeast to northwest on a line that parallels 950 West street. This area is characterized by primarily residential land use, including a mixture of longer-established and more recently-developed neighborhoods.
- **Block Group 5 in Census Tract 1260** is located immediately to the west of Block Group 4, extending west as far as 2200 West and bounded on the south by Weaver Lane. This block group encompasses the westernmost areas of residential development in the study area, and contains a mixture of residential land use and undeveloped (primarily agricultural) land areas. This area is characterized by substantial numbers of recently-constructed homes in newer residential neighborhoods.

Selected social and demographic characteristics of the population living in these three Census Tract Block Groups are summarized in Table 3-1. The combined population of the three block groups was 5,658 persons in 2000, representing 9.7% of the total Layton population. The percentages of non-white residents varied sharply across the three block groups, ranging from a high of 10.9% in Block Group 3 (located farthest to the east, adjoining the I-15 corridor), to 7.2% in Block Group 4, to just 1.7% in Block Group 5. The percentage of residents classified in 2000 as Hispanic varied in a similar pattern across the block groups, with the highest concentration of Hispanic residents evident in Block Group 3 (9.3%), a slightly lower concentration evident in Block Group 4 (8.5%), and a much lower presence of Hispanic residents evident in Block Group 5 (2.9%).

A majority of families residing in these block groups had children under age 18 living at home in 2000. The highest concentration of families with children was observed in the western portions of the study area represented by Block Group 5, where nearly three-fourths (73.7%) of families had children under age 18, considerably higher than the figures for other portions of the study area or for Layton City as a whole. None of the

block groups exhibited an unusually high concentration of older residents. In Block Group 4 the data indicate that 5.8% of residents were age 65 or older, just slightly higher than the percentage reported for Layton City as a whole. Both of the other block groups had lower concentrations of residents in this older age bracket.

Median household income levels in 1999 varied substantially across the three block group areas. In Block Group 3 the median income was just \$43,889, substantially below the figures reported for Layton City and Davis County. In Block Group 4 the median household income was \$49,303, still below the city-wide and county-wide figures. In contrast, median household income in Block Group 5 was \$63,807, substantially higher than the figures reported for either of the other block group areas, for Layton as a whole, or for Davis County. This spatial differentiation of average household income levels is mirrored in the figures on the percent of residents classified as falling below the poverty level threshold. Nearly one in ten (9.8%) of residents in Block Group 3 were below the poverty threshold in 1999, compared to just 4% in Block Group 4 and 2.7% in Block Group 5.

What are the social conditions and characteristics of specific areas and neighborhoods in the study area?

Additional documentation of social conditions among residents of households located within designated portions of the project area is provided by results from the community social survey. In addition to detailing selected demographic characteristics of residents, several major aspects of local social organization are explored, including neighborhood social integration and community cohesion, neighborhood interaction patterns, and patterns of use and activity on roadways that might be altered or affected by proposed project activities. Survey results are reported separately for respondents whose residential properties are located in areas immediately adjacent to proposed project construction areas, those whose properties are located in “nearby off-corridor” areas within 2-3 blocks of construction areas, and those who live elsewhere throughout the study area at greater distance from the areas where project construction activities are proposed.

Resident and Household Characteristics

Several questions were included in the survey questionnaire to assess the socio-demographic characteristics of residents and households in the three designated study area segments. Table 3-2 presents an overview of all of the social and demographic characteristics discussed in this section.

The presence of households with only one or two members was somewhat lower (20.0%) in the “project adjacent” neighborhoods than was the case in either the “nearby off-corridor” (34.4%) or “distant off-corridor” (27.0%) portions of the study area. While the percentage of surveyed households in which one or more residents was reported to be age

65 or older was not very different across the three categories, that percentage was highest within the “project adjacent” areas. Across each of the categories roughly two out of three survey respondents indicated that their household includes one or more children under the age of 18, with the highest presence of children reported by those living in the “distant off-corridor” areas (69.6%).

More substantial differences are evident across the three study area segments when we turn attention to survey responses that pertain to ethnicity and race. As indicated in Table 3-2, the concentration of Hispanic residents appears to be much higher in the “project adjacent” areas than in other portions of the project area. Over one-third (37%) of respondents living in project-adjacent neighborhoods indicated that they are of Hispanic origin, and 38.9% reported that one or more other members of their households are Hispanic. In contrast, fewer than 8% of respondents living in the “nearby off-corridor” areas and fewer than 5% of those in more distant off-corridor portions of the study area identified themselves as Hispanic. Similarly sharp variations across these study area segments were evident when examining the racial characteristics of survey participants. Approximately three out of ten (30.6%) of the respondents living in “project adjacent” areas identified themselves as non-white, and a higher percentage (40.4%) reported that another member of their household is non-white. In contrast, only 9.5% of “nearby off-corridor” and 4.2% of “distant off-corridor” respondents identified themselves as non-white. Overall, it is clear that racial and ethnic minority populations are concentrated at significantly higher levels in the localized neighborhoods situated nearest to proposed project construction areas than is the case in other portions of the surrounding study area.

In addition, the survey data indicate that income levels tend to be considerably lower among residents of the “project adjacent” areas particularly, and to a lesser extent in the “nearby off-corridor” areas, than in more distant off-corridor portions of the study area. Nearly two out of three (65.1%) of survey respondents in the “project adjacent” areas reported total household income levels under \$40,000. In contrast, fewer than one-half (47.7%) of respondents in the “nearby off-corridor” areas, and only about one out of ten (11.1%) of those in the more distant “off-corridor” areas, reported household incomes of less than \$40,000. At the same time, respondents living in “project adjacent” areas were considerably less likely to report annual household incomes of \$80,000 or more (15.2%) than were those living in either nearby off-corridor (27.8%) or more distant off-corridor (26.5%) areas.

Finally, the presence of households falling below the federally-designated poverty levels (adjusted for household size) is much higher in the project-adjacent areas (21.8% of responding households) than is the case for either the nearby off-corridor areas (8.5% of households) or the more distant off-corridor households (0% of households). In addition, these below-poverty households are spatially concentrated in three specific localized neighborhoods. Within the “project adjacent” category, all of the 12 households classified as falling below the poverty level are located in the mobile home park located at 189 South Main Street. Within the “nearby off-corridor” category, 4 below-poverty households are located in the Knowlton Street apartment complex, and three are located on Twin Trees Lane.

In combination, these response patterns indicate that, in comparison to the overall population of Layton and to portions of the broader study area located at greater distance from project construction areas, residents whose homes and neighborhoods are immediately adjacent to project construction areas are much more likely to be Hispanic, much more likely to be a member of a racial minority group, much more likely to report relatively low household incomes, and much more likely to live in poverty. They are also considerably less likely than residents of the other two portions of the study area to live in households that include only one or two residents.

Neighborhood Social Integration and Cohesion

Several questions included in the survey questionnaire measured various aspects of social integration and cohesion in the study area. These questions focus on levels of interaction among residents and the strength of residents' attachment to their neighborhoods. This information provides an important benchmark for evaluating the extent to which disruptive social effects might occur as a result of changes accompanying the proposed Layton interchange construction activities.

Respondents were first asked to indicate how long they had lived in their current home in the study area. Inclusion of this question reflects the tendency for longer-term residents to exhibit higher levels of social attachment and integration into neighborhood and community life than is the case among shorter-term residents. Survey results indicate that the proportion of residents who have lived in their current home for more than 10 years is highest among those who live in the more distant off-corridor portions of the study area (31.5%), lower among those in the project-adjacent areas (20.0%), and lowest in the nearby off-corridor areas (11.4%). Overall, it appears that relatively few study area residents have very long-term ties to their current homes and neighborhoods, since in all three of the study area segments a substantial majority of respondents have lived in their homes for 10 years or less.

A second item in this portion of the questionnaire asked respondents how many adults living in the ten houses located nearest to their own they know on a first-name basis. A higher proportion of residents living in the more distant off-corridor areas (49.3%) and in the nearby off-corridor (45.1%) areas reported knowing ten or more of their adult neighbors than was the case among respondents living in the project-adjacent neighborhoods (18.2%). Conversely, nearly three out of ten (29.1%) of those living in the project-adjacent areas said that they know nobody or only one or two adults from the ten homes located nearest to theirs, compared to 16.9% of respondents from the nearby off-corridor areas and just 6.8% of respondents from more distant off-corridor portions of the study area.

Respondents were also asked to indicate how many of their closest personal friends live within their neighborhood (e.g., within a 2 to 3 block distance from their home). About one-third (34.7%) of respondents living in the more distant off-corridor portions of the study area reported that they have no close personal friends living in the local

neighborhood, compared to 29.1% of respondents living in the project-adjacent areas and 23.9% of those living in the nearby off-corridor areas. Fewer than one out of ten respondents in any of the three areas indicated that they have more than 10 close personal friends living within their local neighborhoods.

Respondents were next asked how often they visit or get together with any of their neighbors for informal social activities like playing cards, cookouts, or going to dinner. The percentage of individuals indicating that they “never” engage in these types of neighboring activities was highest in the corridor-adjacent areas (31.5%) and in the more distant off-corridor areas (also 31.5%), and just slightly lower in the nearby off-corridor areas (28.2%). Also, roughly similar proportions of respondents from each of these project area segments (44.5% from the project-adjacent category, 40.9% from the nearby off-corridor category, and 35.6% from the more distant off-corridor category) indicated that they engage in such interactions with neighbors at least once every month or two, or more often.

Another dimension of neighborhood interaction and activity was addressed with a question that asked respondents how often they get out in their neighborhood for a walk, jog or bicycle ride that takes them farther than one block from their home. Such activity is apparently less common among residents living in project-adjacent portions of the study area than in the other areas. Nearly one fourth (24.5%) of respondents from project-adjacent areas said that the “never or almost never” walk, jog or bicycle in their local neighborhoods, compared to just 9.9% of those living in the nearby off-corridor areas and 11.0% of those in more distant off-corridor locations. At the same time, it is important to note that substantial proportions of respondents throughout the study area (39.6% of those in project-adjacent areas; 49.3% in nearby off-corridor areas; 35.6% in more distant off-corridor areas) said that they do engage in these types of activity once a week or more.

A substantially higher proportion of respondents living in the nearby off-corridor portions of the study area (39.4%) expected that they either definitely or probably will move from their current homes within the next 2 to 3 years than was the case for respondents living in project-adjacent areas (18.2%) or more distant off-corridor locations (12.3%). Respondents were also asked how sorry or pleased they would be to move away from their neighborhoods if they had to leave for some reason. Respondents living in the project-adjacent areas (49.1%) and in the more distant off-corridor areas (47.9%) were somewhat more likely to say that they would be “very sorry” to move than were those living in the nearby off-corridor areas (41.4%).

Overall, responses to this series of questions provide mixed evidence regarding the levels of social cohesion and neighborhood integration that exist among residents of the study area. Those whose homes are located in areas immediately adjacent to the proposed project construction activities appear somewhat less likely than those living in other portions of the study area to know their nearby neighbors, and less likely to get out in their neighborhoods to walk, jog or bicycle. They are also less likely than those living in more distant off-corridor areas to have lived in their homes for longer than 10 years. At

the same time, residents of the nearby off-corridor areas are least likely to have lived in their homes for more than 10 years, most likely to anticipate moving from their current homes within the next 2-3 years, and least likely to indicate that they would be bothered by the prospect of moving from their current homes. Taken as a whole, survey responses do not reveal an especially high level of localized social interaction, social cohesion, or neighborhood involvement across any of the three spatially-defined segments of the study area. While some residents are undoubtedly very strongly attached to their homes and neighborhoods and very actively involved in neighborhood and community life, many others appear to have weaker and more limited community ties.

What do area residents have to say about traffic and transportation conditions?

Several survey questions were designed to assess area residents' use of selected roads and highways in and around their community, and their views about current traffic conditions and problems in the area.

I-15 driving experiences

The first set of questions in this series asked respondents to report on the frequency with which they or members of their household drive on I-15, and their experiences with traffic congestion when they do so. Most of the survey respondents living in the "project adjacent" portions of the study area reported that they drive on portions of I-15 that extend to the north of Layton either daily or nearly every day (42.6%) or at least several times a week (16.7%). Among those living in the nearby off-corridor areas, 34.6% of respondents said they drive north on I-15 nearly every day (34.3%) or several times a week (20%). Respondents living in more distant off-corridor portions of the study area report driving north on I-15 slightly less often – 28.8% said they do so nearly every day, and 20.5% said they do so several times a week.

Respondents from all three of the study area segments reported driving more frequently on portions of I-15 that extend to the south of Layton. Among those living in corridor-adjacent areas, 49.1% said they or members of their households do so nearly every day, and 21.8% said they do so several times a week. Similarly, most respondents in the nearby off-corridor areas and the more distant off-corridor areas reported driving on these segments of I-15 either daily (52.1% and 49.3%, respectively) or several times a week (18.3% and 23.3%, respectively).

When asked about the extent to which they experience traffic delays and congestion when they try to access I-15 in order to drive north of Layton, survey participants from all three of the study area segments were most likely to indicate that they experience either "moderate problems" (34.5% of project-adjacent respondents; 39.4% of nearby off-corridor respondents; 49.3% of more distant off-corridor respondents) or "minor problems" (32.7% for project-adjacent; 28.2% for nearby off-corridor; 28.8% for distant off-corridor). Smaller numbers (14.5% of project-adjacent; 14.1% of nearby off-corridor;

19.2% of distant off-corridor) respondents reported that they experience “serious problems” with traffic congestion and delays when accessing northbound I-15.

Similarly, respondents were asked about their experiences with traffic delays and congestion when they are southbound on portions of I-15 located north of Layton and they wish to exit the interstate and return to their community. Once again, most respondents indicated that they and members of their households experience either “moderate” or “minor” problems when driving such a route (27.3% “moderate problems” and 23.6% “minor problems” among project-adjacent respondents; 31% and 36.6% for nearby off-corridor respondents; 35.6% and 32.9% for distant off-corridor respondents). Substantially fewer people cited “major problems” when their driving involves this route (18.2% for project-adjacent; 11.3% for nearby off-corridor; 15.1% for distant off-corridor respondents).

Survey participants were also asked about the extent to which they or household members experience problems with delays and congestion when they access I-15 in order to drive south of Layton. Once again, respondents were most likely to report that they experience “moderate problems” (28.8% for those living in project-adjacent areas; 26.1% for nearby off-corridor areas; 35.6% for distant off-corridor areas) or “minor problems” (37% for project-adjacent; 29.6% for nearby off-corridor; 32.9% for distant off-corridor areas). Fewer respondents cited “major” congestion and delay problems involving southbound access to I-15 (19.2% for residents of project-adjacent areas; 19.1% for nearby off-corridor areas; 15.1% for distant off-corridor areas).

Similar response patterns emerged when respondents were asked about problems encountered when they are northbound on portions of I-15 located south of Layton and they wish to exit and return to their community. Most respondents from each of the three study area segments said that they or household members experience either moderate or minor problems when driving this route (35.5% and 35.5% for residents of project-adjacent areas; 32.8% and 30.8% for those in nearby off-corridor areas; 37.3% and 30.7% for those in distant off-corridor areas). Serious problems associated with driving this route were cited by 11.8% of those in project-adjacent areas, 14.9% of those in nearby off-corridor areas, and 20% of those in distant off-corridor areas.

Gentile Street driving experiences

A parallel set of questions asked survey participants about their experiences driving on Gentile Street in Layton. A substantial majority of respondents indicated that they or members of their households drive daily or nearly every day on this roadway (70.4% of those living in project-adjacent areas; 76.1% of those in nearby off-corridor areas; 80.8% of those living in distant off-corridor areas). When asked to evaluate the severity of problems with traffic congestion and delays on Gentile Street, most respondents indicated that they experience either “minor problems” (34.5% of those living in project-adjacent areas; 36.1% of those in nearby off-corridor areas; 30.7% of those in distant off-corridor areas) or “moderate problems” (21.8% for project-adjacent areas; 26.4% for nearby off-

corridor areas; 37.7% for distant off-corridor areas). The percentage of respondents indicating that they experience “no problems” with congestion and delays on Gentile Street was higher among residents of project-adjacent areas (21.8%) and nearby off-corridor areas (20.8%) than was the case among those living in more distant off-corridor locations (12%).

Residents’ views about the importance of transportation improvements

The final two questions in this portion of the survey questionnaire asked respondents to evaluate the importance of developing local area transportation improvements, in light of the rapid growth that is occurring in and around Layton. The first of these questions focused on transportation developments that could improve access to and from I-15 for people who live or work in Layton. Most respondents indicated that they consider such improvements to be either very important (42.6% among residents of project-adjacent areas; 46.5% in nearby off-corridor areas; 65.3% for more distant off-corridor areas) or moderately important (29.6% of responses in project-adjacent areas; 26.8% in nearby off-corridor areas; 24% in distant off-corridor areas). In all three areas only a small minority (well below 10%) of respondents indicated that they consider improved access to and from I-15 to be “not at all important.”

Survey participants were also asked about the importance of developing surface street transportation improvements that could make it easier to drive between neighborhoods located in west Layton and other areas of the city located near to or east of the I-15 corridor. The most common responses to this question were “very important” (33.3% of response among residents of project-adjacent areas; 32.4% for nearby off-corridor areas; 52.6% for distant off-corridor areas) or “moderately important” (27.8% for project-adjacent areas; 31% for nearby off-corridor areas; 30.3% for distant off-corridor areas). Far fewer respondents indicated that they consider such improvements to be “not at all important” (16.7% of project-adjacent responses; 7% of nearby off-corridor responses; 6.6% of distant off-corridor responses).

What do area residents think about the possible consequences of the proposed Layton Interchange project?

An additional series of items included in the survey questionnaire addressed area residents’ views about potential impacts of the proposed Layton Interchange transportation improvement project. Survey participants were provided with an information sheet outlining key aspects of the project, and also were informed within the questionnaire itself about specific construction activities that have been proposed. They were then asked provide their views about possible effects of the proposed project, and also about possible effects of a “no build” alternative that would maintain current road conditions.

Anticipated project effects on the community as a whole

The first of these questions asked participants to consider possible effects of the proposed project on the community of Layton as a whole. Response patterns to this question were rather mixed within each of the three study area segments. In the project-adjacent neighborhoods, 16.4% of respondents indicated that they expect community-wide effects to be “very positive”, and 32.7% anticipate “moderately positive” effects. At the same time, 21.8% of respondents in project-adjacent neighborhoods anticipate “very negative” effects from the project for the community as a whole, and 12.7% expect effects to be “moderately negative.” Residents of the nearby off-corridor neighborhoods were about equally likely to expect positive project effects or negative effects -- 12.5% selected the “very positive” response and 29.2% chose “moderately positive,” while 19.4% chose “very negative” and 18.1% chose “moderately negative.” The perspectives of residents living in the more distant off-corridor portions of the study area were considerably more positive – 31.9% of respondents in these areas anticipate “very positive” community-wide effects and 43.1% expect effects to be “moderately positive,” while only 5.6% expect effects to be “very negative,” and 12.5% expect “moderately negative” consequences.

Anticipated project effects on local neighborhoods

Similarly, respondents were asked to consider the possible effects of the proposed project on the local neighborhood areas located within two blocks of their homes. Residents of project-adjacent neighborhoods were more likely to anticipate negative localized effects (29.1% chose “very negative” and 16.4% chose “moderately negative”) than to expect positive effects (14.5% chose “very positive” and 23.6% chose “moderately positive”). Residents of the nearby off-corridor areas expressed substantially greater concern about negative consequences to their neighborhoods – 37.5% of respondents from these areas anticipate “very negative” effects and 20.8% anticipate “moderately negative” effects, compared to just 8.3% who expect that the project will have “very positive” neighborhood effects and 12.5% who expect effects to be “moderately positive.” Responses from the more distant off-corridor areas were more evenly divided, with 15% of respondents indicating that they anticipate “very positive” project effects on their neighborhoods and 23.7% expecting that effects would be “moderately positive,” compared to 13.2% who expect “very negative” effects and 23.7% who expect “moderately negative” consequences.

Anticipated project effects on residents and their families

The next question in this series asked respondents to evaluate the possible effects of the proposed transportation improvement activities on themselves and their families. On balance, residents of the project-adjacent and nearby off-corridor areas expressed considerably more concern than did those living in more distant off-corridor areas. Among those living in project-adjacent areas, 32.1% of respondents anticipate “very

negative” effects on themselves and their families and 15.1% anticipate “moderately negative” effects, compared to 15.1% who expect effects to be “very positive” and 17% who expect “moderately positive” effects. In the nearby off-corridor areas 29.6% of survey participants chose the “very negative” response and 23.9% chose “moderately negative,” compared to just 9.9% who selected “very positive” and 15.5% who answered “moderately positive.” In contrast, residents of the more distant off-corridor areas were most likely to anticipate either “very positive” (21.3%) or “moderately positive” (30.7%) project effects on themselves and their families, compared to just 10.7% who anticipate “very negative” effects and 17.3% who expect effects to be “moderately negative.”

Anticipated effects on property values

Respondents were also asked whether they expected that the proposed road construction activities would affect the value of their home and property. About one-half (50.9%) of those living in the project-adjacent areas indicated that they expect some decrease in their property values due to project implementation, with nearly a quarter (23.5%) suggesting that they anticipate a decrease of 50% or more. Similarly, about half (50.7%) of respondents from the nearby off-corridor areas anticipate some project-induced decrease in their property values, though fewer (14.5%) anticipate that such a decrease might be on the order of 50% or more. In the more distant off-corridor areas about one-third (32.5%) of respondents indicated that they expect project activities to cause a decline in their property values, with very few (1.4%) anticipating that the value would decrease by 50% or more.

Expectations to move in response to project implementation

The next question in this series asked survey participants whether they would anticipate moving away from their current homes within two years of project completion if the proposed transportation improvements are implemented. Relatively few respondents from any of the three study area segments suggested that they almost certainly would move in response to the project (17% of those in the project-adjacent area; 19.4% of those in nearby off-corridor areas; 9.2% of those in more distant off-corridor areas).

Anticipated positive and negative consequences of the project

The survey also included an open-ended question providing respondents with the opportunity to describe in their own words the most important positive consequences as well as the most important negative consequences that they anticipate would result from implementation of the proposed transportation improvement project. Comments focusing on anticipated positive project effects revolved primarily around two related sets of expectations: reduced traffic congestion and delays in the community (50% of responses provided by residents of project-adjacent areas, 50% of responses from nearby off-corridor areas, and 45% of responses from more distant off-corridor areas), and easier

driving access to and from I-15 (22.2% of responses in project-adjacent areas, 27.1% in nearby off-corridor areas, and 33.3% in more distant off-corridor areas).

Comments regarding anticipated negative consequences varied more widely across the three study area segments. Among residents living in project-adjacent areas, the most frequent responses involved expressions of concern about the possibility of forced relocation due to removal of homes (30% of responses), noise impacts (17.5%), construction-period disturbances, traffic delays, and inconvenience (7.5%), and disruptions to the established character of their neighborhoods (7.5%). Among those living in the nearby off-corridor areas, expressions of concern about potential negative effects focused on increased traffic levels in general (33.3%), increased traffic on Flint Street specifically (18.5%), construction-period disturbances, traffic delays, and inconvenience (13%), noise effects (7.4%) and disruptions to established neighborhood characteristics (7.4%). Residents of the more distant off-corridor areas most frequently comment on concerns about construction-period disturbances (26.2%), increased traffic levels in general (21.3%), noise effects (14.8%), and increased traffic on Flint Street (8.2%).

What do area residents think about the possible consequences of selecting a “No Build” alternative?

Anticipated project effects on the community as a whole

In the last series of questions, survey respondents were asked to consider the possible community-wide, neighborhood, and personal consequences of implementing a “No Build” alternative that would maintain existing transportation infrastructure and conditions in the study area. The first question in this series asked respondents to evaluate the effects that they expect such a decision would have for the local community as a whole. Responses to this question varied considerably across the three study area segments. In the project adjacent areas about one-fourth of respondents anticipate positive community effects (20.8% chose “very positive” and 5.7% chose “moderately positive”); slightly over one-third (37.7%) expect that effects would be neither positive or negative; and about one-third expect that the no-build option would cause negative community consequences (18.9% chose “very negative” and 17% chose “moderately negative”). In the nearby off-corridor areas slightly over one-fourth of respondents anticipate positive community-wide effects of a no-build option (15.9% “very positive” and 11.6% “moderately positive”), one in three (34.8%) expect neither positive or negative effects, and over one-third expect negative consequences (15.9% “very negative” and 21.7% “moderately negative”). In contrast, residents of the more distant off-corridor areas expressed more pessimistic views about the community effects of a no-build decision. Only 16% of respondents from these areas anticipate that effects would be positive (8.1% “very positive” and 8.1% “moderately positive”), while well over one-half expect that effects would be negative (31.1% “very negative” and 27% “moderately negative”) for the community as a whole.

When asked to consider possible effects of a no build decision on the neighborhoods within two blocks of their homes, respondents expressed mixed viewpoints. In each of the study area segments the most common response to this question was “neither positive or negative” (41.5% of responses in project-adjacent areas, 39.7% in nearby off-corridor areas, and 33.6% in more distant off-corridor areas). Residents of project-adjacent areas were about equally divided in anticipating either positive neighborhood consequences of a no-build decision (18.9% “very positive” and 11.3% “moderately positive”) or negative consequences (17% “very negative” and 11.3% “moderately negative”). In the nearby off-corridor areas there was a greater tendency for respondents to anticipate positive neighborhood consequences of a no-build decision (27.9% “very positive” and 11.8% “moderately positive”) as opposed to negative consequences (1.5% “very negative” and 19.1% “moderately negative”). In contrast, residents of more distant off-corridor areas were more likely to anticipate negative effects (18.9% “very negative” and 23% “moderately negative”) than to expect positive neighborhood effects (10.8% “very positive” and 13.5% “moderately positive”).

Similarly, project-adjacent and nearby off-corridor residents were more likely than those living in distant off-corridor areas to expect that a no-build decision would have positive effects for themselves and their families. In the project-adjacent areas, nearly four out of ten respondents anticipate positive personal effects of a no-build decision (32.1% “very positive” and 7.5% “moderately positive”), while one in four expect negative effects (15.1% “very negative” and 9.4% “moderately negative”). The distribution is similar in the nearby off-corridor areas, where 32.4% of respondents anticipate “very positive” effects and 7.4% expect “moderately positive” effects, while only 4.4% expect “very negative” effects and 16.2% expect that effects would be “moderately negative.” Residents of more distant off-corridor areas were more likely to anticipate negative effects on themselves and their families – 10.8% of respondents from this segment of the study area indicated that they would anticipate “very negative” effects to accompany a no-build decision and 27% anticipate “moderately negative” effects, compared to 9.5% who anticipate “very positive” effects and 10.8% who anticipate “moderately positive” effects.

Table 3-1. Selected Population Characteristics in 2000 for Davis County, Layton City, and Study Area Census Block Group Areas.

	<u>Block Group 3 Census Tract 1260</u>	<u>Block Group 4 Census Tract 1260</u>	<u>Block Group 5 Census Tract 1260</u>	<u>Layton City</u>	<u>Davis County</u>
Population in area	2,589	1,616	1,453	58,474	238,994
Race – percent non-white	10.9%	7.2%	1.7%	10.1%	7.7%
Percent Hispanic	9.3%	8.5%	2.9%	7.0%	5.4%
Percent age 65 or older	4.0%	5.8%	3.9%	5.7%	7.3%
Percent of families with children under age 18	67.2%	60.1%	73.7%	59.4%	60.5%
Median household income (1999)	\$43,889	\$49,303	\$63,807	\$52,128	\$53,726
Percent of persons below poverty level	9.8%	4.0%	2.7%	5.6%	5.1%

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, <http://factfinder.census.gov> (2000 Census, Summary File 1 and Summary File 3)

Table 3-2 – Social and Demographic Characteristics of Specific Study Area Segments (2007 community survey results).

	<u>Project-Adjacent Neighborhoods</u>	<u>Nearby Off-Corridor Neighborhoods</u>	<u>Distant Off-Corridor Neighborhoods</u>
Households with one or two occupants	20.0%	34.4%	27.0%
Households with at least one occupant age 65 or older	21.4%	17.3%	19.7%
Households with at least one child age 18 or younger	65.4%	63.5%	69.6%
Respondent identified as Hispanic	37.0%	7.6%	4.2%
Other household member(s) identified as Hispanic	38.9%	12.1%	5.6%
Respondent identified as non-white	30.6%	9.5%	4.2%
Other household members(s) identified as non-white	40.4%	11.3%	4.4%
Annual household income below \$40,000	65.1%	47.7%	11.1%
Annual household income above \$80,000	15.2%	27.8%	26.5%
Households classified as below poverty threshold	21.8%	8.5%	0.0%

ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations, signed by the President on February 11, 1994, directs federal agencies to take the appropriate and necessary steps to identify and address disproportionately high and adverse effects of federal projects on the health or environment of minority and low-income populations to the greatest extent possible and permitted by law.

Fundamental Environmental Justice principles include:

- To avoid, minimize, or mitigate disproportionately high and adverse human health and environmental effects, including social and economic effects, on minority populations and low-income populations;
- To ensure the full and fair participation by all potentially affected communities in the transportation decision-making process;
- To prevent the denial, reduction in, or substantial delay in the receipt of benefits by minority and low-income populations

Executive Order 12898 and the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Orders on Environmental Justice address persons belonging to any of the following groups:

- **Black** – a person having origins in any of the black racial groups of Africa
- **Hispanic** – a person of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, or other Spanish culture or origin, regardless of race
- **Asian** – a person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, or the Indian subcontinent
- **American Indian and Alaskan Native** – a person having origins in any of the original people of North America and who maintains cultural identification through tribal affiliation or community recognition
- **Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander** – a person having origins in any of the original peoples of Hawaii, Guam, Samoa, or other Pacific Islands
- **Low income** – a person whose household income (or in the case of a community or group, whose median household income) is at or below the HHS poverty guidelines

As discussed in the Social section of this chapter, Layton exhibits limited overall racial or ethnic diversity, with 90% of residents classified as white in 2000. Hispanic/Latino persons represent the single largest ethnic/racial minority group in the community, comprising 7% of the city's population in 2000. Approximately 16% of households had incomes under \$25,000 in 1999, and 5.6% of residents lived in households in which income fell below the official poverty level.

Minority Populations

Census data

Racial and ethnic characteristics and household income data for three Census Block Group areas (see Figure 3-1) which in combination roughly correspond to the project study area are shown in Table 3-3. For Block Group 3, which encompasses much of the eastern portion of the project study area, 4.8% of the non-Hispanic population was comprised of racial minorities (*non-Hispanic* percentage minus the *White alone* percentage – see Table 3-3) and an additional 9.3% of the total population was classified as Hispanic (regardless of race); in combination 14.1% of the population in this block group area was classified as being of racial or ethnic minority status in 2000. For Block Group 4, 3.3% of the non-Hispanic population was comprised of racial minorities and 8.5% of residents were classified as Hispanic, meaning that 11.8% of the total population in the area was identified as being in a racial or ethnic minority group. In Block Group 5, located in the westernmost areas of the study area, 1% of residents were classified as members of a racial minority and 2.6% were classified as Hispanic, producing a combined racial/ethnic population that comprised just 3.6% of the total population in that area. By comparison, for the city of Layton 6.1% of residents were classified as members of a racial minority and 7% were classified as Hispanic in 2000. The overall proportion of minority residents in 2000 was therefore higher in Block Group 3 (the area nearest to I-15 and the proposed highway interchange project) than was the case for Layton as whole or for either of the block group areas located in the central and western portions of the project study area.

Survey data

To better identify the occurrence of minority populations within the project area and the potential for disproportionate impacts to minorities, the survey questionnaire used to collect data for the community social assessment included questions focusing on the racial and ethnic identities of respondents and members of their households. Households selected for participation in the survey were drawn from three spatially-distinct categories within the study area that were differentiated by their proximity to areas where proposed project construction activities would occur. These include a “project adjacent” category comprised of residential properties in immediate proximity to project construction areas and corridors; a “nearby off-corridor” area comprised of residential properties not adjacent to but within a 2-3 block distance of project construction areas, and a “distant off-corridor” category comprised of residences located at greater distance from project construction areas.

In the project-adjacent category 37% of survey respondents identified themselves as being of Hispanic origin, and 38.9% said that one or more other members of their households are Hispanic. By comparison, in the “nearby off-corridor” areas 7.6% of respondents said they are Hispanic, and 12.1% said that other members of their households are Hispanic. In the “distant off-corridor” areas only 4.2% of survey participants identified themselves as being of Hispanic origin, and 5.6% said that other household members are Hispanic. With respect to racial identity, 30.6% of respondents in the “project adjacent” category indicated that their race is something other than white and 40.4% said that one or more other members of their households are non-white. In

the “nearby off-corridor” areas the percentages of respondents identifying themselves and other household members as being non-white were considerably lower (9.5% and 11.3%, respectively). Racial minorities are even less evident in the “distant off-corridor” areas, where only 4.2% of survey participants identified themselves as non-white and 4.4% indicated that one or more other household members are non-white. The specific racial identities of those classifying themselves as non-white are not entirely clear, because in most instances respondents who did not check “White/Caucasian/Anglo” selected the “other” category when answering this question. In many instances where an “other” racial identity was specified, respondents wrote in “Hispanic,” reflecting a common tendency to confound racial and ethnic identities. Despite this, the combined responses clearly reveal that racial and ethnic minority populations are much more heavily concentrated in the “project adjacent” areas than is the case for either the “nearby off-corridor” or “distant off-corridor” areas.

Low Income Populations

A person whose household income is at or below the HHS poverty guidelines is considered low-income. 2007 HHS poverty guidelines identify poverty levels adjusted for household size that range from \$10,210 or less for a household comprised of one person to \$34,570 for a household containing eight members.

Census data

As shown in Table 3-3, median household income levels across the three Census block group areas encompassing the project study area varied from substantially below to substantially above the level for Layton as a whole. In Block Group 3, located in the eastern portions of the study area along the I-15 and Main Street corridors, median household income in 1999 was \$43,889, just 84% of the city-wide median income level of \$52,128. Median household income in Block Group 4 was \$49,303, also less than the city-wide figure. In contrast, the median income for households in Block Group 5 was \$63,807, considerably above the figure for Layton as a whole. Overall, median household income levels (as reported in the 2000 Census) were considerably lower in the eastern segment of the project study area that is located nearest to the I-15 corridor and to the areas where proposed project construction activities would occur.

Data on the percentage of persons living in households with incomes falling below the poverty level illustrate a similar pattern with respect to the spatial differentiation of economic well-being in the study area. As shown in Table 3-3, nearly one out of ten persons living in Block Group 3 fell below the federally-designated poverty threshold in 1999, a figure that is far higher than that reported for the populations located in Block Group 4, Block Group 5, or Layton City as a whole.

Survey data

The community social survey included a question on total household income that, in combination with information on household size, provides a basis for assessing the economic status of project area households and the incidence of households falling below

the poverty threshold. Respondents were asked to report their total current household income by checking one of 16 income categories. The lowest eight of those categories were structured to reflect the U.S. Department of HHS 2007 household poverty thresholds for family units of one to 8 persons.

Responses obtained from surveyed households located in the “project adjacent” areas indicate that the median household income within this category falls within an income bracket that ranges from \$31,091 to \$34,570. Two out of three (65.1%) of the respondents living in these households indicated that their annual household income is lower than \$40,000. A total of 12 of the households in this “project adjacent” area that participated in the survey and provided response to the income question were below the poverty threshold (21.8% of responding households). All of these low-income households are located in the mobile home park located at 189 South Main Street, immediately adjacent to the area where the proposed new interchange on I-15 would be constructed.

In the “nearby off-corridor” category the median income level for households participating in the survey and providing income information fell within the bracket that ranges from \$50,000 to \$59,999. Slightly fewer than one-half (47.7%) of the survey participants in this portion of the study area reported annual household income levels below \$40,000. Seven of the households in this “nearby off-corridor” area (8.5% of responding households) were identified as “low income,” with size-adjusted annual household incomes falling below the federally designated poverty level. Four of these low-income households are in the Knowlton Street apartment complex located east of I-15 near the proposed location for the new interchange facilities, and three are located on Twin Trees Lane.

Responses from the “distant off-corridor” areas indicate that income levels are generally higher there than in the areas located nearer to proposed project construction sites and corridors. The median income level for households from this area that participated in the survey is in the \$50,000 to \$59,999 bracket. Only 11.1% of the households in this portion of the study area reported annual incomes below \$40,000, and none of the participating households was identified as falling below the poverty threshold.

In summary, these data indicate that Environmental Justice populations are disproportionately present in the areas located nearest to the proposed construction areas for the Layton Interchange project. To the extent that project activities would generate adverse social impacts associated with residential relocation, neighborhood disturbance, noise impacts or other adverse consequences, there appears to be some potential for such impacts to be experienced disproportionately by racial and ethnic minority and low-income populations.

Table 3-3. Population Characteristics (from 2000 Census data) Relating to Environmental Justice for Census Block Group Areas within Census Tract 1260 Encompassing the Project Study Area

	<u>Block Group 3</u>	<u>Block Group 4</u>	<u>Block Group 5</u>	<u>Layton City</u>
Total population in area	2,589	1,616	1,453	58,474
NON-HISPANIC POPULATION	2,348 (90.7%)	1,478 (91.5%)	1,411 (97.1%)	54,406 (93.0%)
White alone	2,225 (85.9%)	1,426 (88.2%)	1,396 (96.1%)	50,820 (86.9%)
Black or African American alone	15 (0.6%)	21 (1.3%)	5 (0.3%)	907 (1.6%)
American Indian/Alaskan Native alone	20 (0.8%)	8 (0.5%)	1 (0.1%)	255 (0.4%)
Asian alone	2 (0.1%)	2 (0.1%)	2 (0.1%)	141 (0.2%)
Native Hawaiian/other Pacific Islander alone	32 (1.2%)	14 (0.9%)	2 (0.1%)	1,178 (2.0%)
Other race alone	5 (0.2%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	61 (0.1%)
Two or more races	49 (1.9%)	7 (0.4%)	5 (0.3%)	1,044 (1.8%)
HISPANIC POPULATION	241 (9.3%)	138 (8.5%)	42 (2.6%)	4,068 (7.0%)
White alone	82 (3.2%)	74 (4.6%)	33 (2.3%)	1,753 (3.0%)
Black or African American alone	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	36 (0.1%)
American Indian/Alaskan Native alone	0 (0.0%)	3 (0.2%)	0 (0.0%)	52 (0.1%)
Asian alone	8 (0.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	38 (0.1%)
Native Hawaiian/other Pacific Islander alone	4 (0.2%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	18 (0.03%)
Other race alone	106 (4.1%)	48 (3.0%)	6 (0.2%)	1,743 (3.0%)
Two or more races	41 (1.6%)	13 (0.8%)	3 (0.2%)	428 (0.7%)
Median Household Income	\$43,889	\$49,303	\$63,807	\$52,128
Percent of Persons Below Poverty Level	9.8%	4.0%	2.7%	5.1%

Environmental Consequences -- Social Conditions

No Action Alternative

A decision to adopt the No Action Alternative would leave existing social conditions and trends in the study area intact. Anticipated future population growth and associated residential and commercial development in the area would continue. Subdivision and development of parcels that are currently in agricultural use or otherwise not developed will undoubtedly occur, particularly in the western portions of the community. Even in the absence of new transportation developments these growth and development patterns will inevitably contribute to further reduction in open space, and to continued erosion of the semi-rural lifestyles that some local residents located in less densely-developed portions of the community still hope to preserve.

A decision to not build the proposed I-15 interchange and associated new roadway segments would at least temporarily alleviate the concerns expressed by some residents about construction-related traffic delays and disruptions, increased traffic volume, speed and safety concerns along upgraded and newly-developed roads and other connecting roadways, alteration of existing neighborhood conditions in areas located closest to project construction areas, and possible relocation of some residents. When asked to identify potential positive consequences of a “no build” decision, respondents to the community survey focused most frequently on these areas of concern. Among residents of the “project adjacent” areas, the most common responses revolved around the ability to retain current neighborhood and community conditions (30.8%), elimination of concerns about removal of homes that would require some residents to relocate (23.1%), and avoidance of construction-phase delays and disturbance (11.5%). Residents of the nearby off-corridor areas focused their comments most frequently on the expectation that a “no build” decision would reduce the potential for increased traffic volume into and through their neighborhoods and surrounding portions of the community (28.9%), retain current neighborhood and community conditions (23.7%), avoid construction-phase congestion and disruption (15.8%), and eliminate the need to remove homes and require some residents to relocate (10.5%). In the more distant off-corridor areas, survey participants most frequently identified avoidance of construction-phase delays and disruptions (38.8%), reduced potential for increased traffic levels (14.3%), and reduced concern about increased traffic speed and safety problems (8.2%) as potential positive consequences of not building the proposed project.

At the same time, it is important to note that future growth in and around Layton will inevitably contribute to increased traffic volumes and congestion problems on roadways throughout the city, especially those that provide access between western portions of the project area where future residential expansion is likely to be concentrated and the I-15 corridor. Even though most residents indicate that traffic congestion problems on Gentile Street and problems with access to and from I-15 are of currently of only moderate or minor concern, they also believe that it is important to complete transportation improvements that will make it easier to drive between neighborhoods in west Layton

and other portions of the community and to improve access to and from I-15. Responses to an open-ended question in the community social survey regarding anticipated negative consequences of a “no-build” decision on the Layton Interchange project reinforce these observations. Among the survey participants who provided an answer to this question, the most common responses focused on concerns about continued and worsening future traffic congestion problems in Layton (55% of responses in the project-adjacent areas; 70.6% of responses in the nearby off-corridor areas; 76.9% in the more distant off-corridor areas), and concerns about problems with access to the I-15 corridor (10% of responses in the project adjacent areas; 8.8% in the nearby off-corridor areas; 11.5% in distant off-corridor areas). Implementation of a “No Action” alternative would over the longer term leave many community residents increasingly dissatisfied about traffic congestion and delays on major surface streets and at existing I-15 interchange locations.

Project Construction Alternative

The proposed construction of a new I-15 interchange and associated road construction and upgrades would require the removal of at least three residences from the southeast corner of the mobile home park at 189 South Main Street in Layton. Relocation of these households could prove to be disruptive for the relatively small number of individuals who would be affected, for a variety of reasons. First, even though overall social cohesion does not appear to be unusually strong among residents in the project-adjacent portion of the study area, some residents do report substantial ties with neighbors. The relocation of several households would almost certainly impact neighborhood-based social interaction patterns and social integration levels for members of the relocated households and for the neighbors with whom they are most closely engaged. In addition, difficulties associated with moving older mobile homes and the absence of other mobile home facilities in the nearby area could make it difficult or impossible for the affected residents to have their homes moved to another location. Given the high concentration of lower-income households in this mobile home park, residents who are required to relocate may also find it difficult to secure affordable housing if their mobile homes cannot be relocated.

In the short term, residents of other homes in this mobile home park that would not be removed or relocated, as well as those who live in other project-adjacent areas along Larson Lane and 300 East, would experience increased exposure to construction-related disturbances such as noise, dust, and periodic traffic flow disruptions affecting access to and from their neighborhoods. Residents of nearby off-corridor neighborhoods within a 2-3 block distance of construction areas would also experience these effects, though at somewhat lower intensity. Residents who live throughout the broader community as well as people from other areas who drive through affected portions of Layton would experience inconvenience associated with periodic construction phase road closures, detours, delays, and associated traffic congestion effects.

Longer-term social impacts of the project would be limited. Residents who live in the project-adjacent mobile home park would experience some increase in proximity to I-15

traffic due to the location of the new interchange facility and the southbound off-ramp. However, it is important to note that the I-15 corridor and associated traffic noise are already well-established features of the local landscape for residents of this mobile home neighborhood. As a result, the proposed project would not substantially alter the environmental conditions experienced by people living in the mobile home park.

The relatively small numbers of residents who live in other corridor-adjacent areas would experience more substantial long-term changes in the environmental conditions that characterize their neighborhoods, due primarily to the proximity of the proposed new roadway between Flint Street and Fort Lane and associated increases in exposure to traffic volumes and traffic noise. The potential for this new access corridor to generate increased traffic levels on these two existing roadways and perhaps other nearby surface streets, could expose residents of other surrounding neighborhoods to such effects as well.

Because the proposed project does not involve routing of new or expanded roadways directly through established residential neighborhoods, it is not likely that existing patterns of social interaction and engagement among residents of project area neighborhoods would be altered, and existing levels of community social cohesion would not be adversely impacted. Population growth patterns, levels of familiarity and interaction among neighbors, and neighborhood activity patterns are not likely to change due to the proposed transportation developments. Few survey respondents indicated that they would expect to move from their current homes in response to implementation of the proposed transportation improvements, and there is little reason to expect that the project would stimulate changes in the composition of local populations or the rate of population turnover already occurring in the study area. On balance, the social characteristics of established residential neighborhoods throughout the project area would not be altered in any significant way by construction of the proposed new I-15 interchange and associated access road facilities.

Mitigation

Many residents living nearest to proposed project construction areas are concerned about the effects of increased exposure to traffic noise. Those concerns could be addressed by the location of sound barrier structures in areas where they would be feasible and effective, and also by effective use of landscaping and vegetative screening that could moderate both noise effects and visual impacts of the project.

Resident concerns about increased traffic volumes and traffic speed and associated auto and pedestrian safety issues along the proposed new roadway and on connecting surface streets could be addressed through the placement of pedestrian sidewalks along all new roadway segments, use of traffic signals and pedestrian crosswalks at major intersections, and the implementation of appropriate speed limits on affected roadways.

Potential economic impacts to residents of households impacted by the need to remove their homes could be addressed through established mechanisms designed to purchase those homes at fair market value, and by provision of financial assistance to cover relocation expenses.

Environmental Justice

The concentration of ethnic and racial minorities and low-income households in areas located in close proximity to project construction areas suggests that Environmental Justice issues could be a potential area of concern with this project. However, because the project is not expected to cause significant changes to the environmental and social conditions experienced by most residents in project adjacent neighborhoods or other nearby residential areas, there is little reason to anticipate disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority and low-income populations as a whole. Provision of appropriate compensation and financial assistance to the several households that would be directly affected by removal of their homes would help to minimize or mitigate the effects experienced by that relatively small number of individuals.